DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 137 JC 820 390

TITLE	Administrative Job Level Study and Factoring System.
INSTITUTION	Portland Community Coll., Oreg.
PUB DATE	May 82
NOTE	82p.; Prepared by the Educational Services Research and Planning Department.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Responsibility; Administrators; *College Administration; Community Colleges; *Employment Level; Factor Structure; *Job Analysis; *Occupational Information; *Salaries; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

The administrative job classification system and generic job descriptions presented in this report were developed at Portland Community College (PCC) as management tools. After introductory material outlining the objectives of and criteria used in the administrative job-level study, and offering information on the administrative job factoring system, the process used to develop the system is explained. Weight assignments, used in the factoring system, are indicated for administrators' education, experience, and responsibilities in the areas of supervision; contacts with students and other individuals and groups within and outside the college; finances; instruction; college operations; management decisions and planning; and presidential assignment. A job description worksheet and instructions for using it are followed by examples of completed administrator job factor forms and detailed instructions for using the job factoring system. Next, generic job descriptions are provided for seven levels of administrative positions, along with salary information and lists of job titles appropriate to each level. After a series of data tables compares PCC's administrative salaries with those of other community colleges, an extensive bibliography concludes the report. (KL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220137

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ADMINISTRATIVE JOB LEVEL STUDY AND FACTORING SYSTEM

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. H. Anthony

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 820 390

Prepared by

Research and Planning Department
Educational Services

May, 1982

©1982
Portland Community College
Portland, Oregon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page No.
Part I	Introduction	
	The Assignment	1
	Criteria	1
	Administrative Job Factoring System Information	2
Part II	Procedures	
	Procedures (past, present and future)	7
	Administrative Job Description Work Sheet Form	12
	Job Description Form	21
Part III	The System	
	Administrative Job Factors Form	23
	Instructions for Use of Administrative Job Factors	32
	Factor Tally Sheet Form	36
	Consultants Critique	37
Part IV	Results	
	Generic Job Descriptions	41
	Administrative/Supervisory/Support Staff Position Levels and Titles	57
	Administrative Job Level Classification	58
	Administrative Job Level Placement	59
Part V	Salary Comparisons	
	Salary Comparison of Benchmark positions with other educational institutions and government agencies	65
Part VI	References	
	Bibliography	66

811551

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Administrative Job Level Study
and
Factoring System

ASSIGNMENT: Create as a management tool an administrative job classification system and generic job descriptions using the factoring system concept. Base the system on objectivity and equitability. Place current staff at the appropriate level and job description.

CRITERIA:

1. Current administrative salary guide is to be continued using levels "A" through "G" with ranges but no steps.

2. Certain jobs designated as "benchmarks" by the President were assumed to be currently placed on the correct salary level. The educational, experience and responsibility components of these jobs were analyzed and used as a starting basis for the factoring system.

3. The President assigned weights to the various components which make up the factoring system.

4. Use requirements of the job contained in current job descriptions and current replacement criteria are to be used as the primary consideration, rather than qualifications of incumbents.

ADMINISTRATIVE JOB FACTORING SYSTEM INFORMATION

What is position classification?

A System developed to obtain the following results:

- Employees who perform like work should be paid like wages.
- Jobs can be grouped together for other personnel purposes such as recruitment, selection and training.
- Differences in pay should be based on significant differences in duties, responsibilities and qualification requirements.

What is a factoring system?

There are two main types of position classification:

Nonquantitative (position classification-whole job approach)

Quantitative (factor point system)

These two approaches are distinguished primarily by the fact that the quantitative system uses predefined factors and quantitative point scales to evaluate positions while the nonquantitative does not. In recent years the quantitative system has been increasingly adopted by many different kinds of public organizations.

Following are a few brief comparisons:[1)]

	Nonquantitative	Quantitative
1.	Installation and maintenance	
	Requires the least time to install and can be accomplished by staff with less in-depth technical background. Classification decisions depend on skills and judgment of classifier. Takes many years for average classifier to acquire skills needed to make valid judgments.	Takes more time to develop and requires more specialized staff. Expensive to install. Standard factor definitions and point scales facilitate classifying new positions and restructuring or reclassifying existing ones. Can be applied by trained staff with less extensive classification experience and takes less time to train classifier.
2.	Acceptance	
	System is widely known which makes it easy to gain acceptance. In actual operation, disagreements may arise because decisions are mostly judgmental. Does not always provide easily justifiable, convincing rationales for classification decisions.	Fear of the unknown and high costs of installation may generate resistance. Once understood, acceptance tends to be high. Facilitates resolution of classification appeals and grievances.
3.	Technical Adequacy	
	Decisions are judgmental and could lead to varying results when made by different classifiers. Does not define internal relationships by job factors. Responds easily to changing labor market conditions by adjusting salary levels of entire occupational groups.	Points assigned to job factors provide objective and consistent measure of job value. Permits internal comparisons of positions, factor by factor. Requires modification of factor definitions or point scales to reflect external labor market conditions.

1) Exerpts from "Position Classification: A Guide for City and County Managers", U. S. Office of Personnel Management, Washington, D. C. 11/79

How are "factors" and points developed?

. Factors include common denominators that can be found in varying amounts in most of the jobs to be evaluated.

. Factors measured commonly include:

Prerequisites of the job -

Education
Experience

What the job itself requires -

Accountability
Problem Solving
Independent Judgment
Supervision (of and by whom)

And consequences to the employer - (PCC as a whole) of actions taken by the incumbent.

. Weight given to each factor as a percentage of the whole will normally be a decision made by top management or the executive officer.

. Key jobs are selected causing them to be points of reference or "benchmarks."

These jobs should be:

- Relatively stable in job content
- Good reference points in job structures as to level of difficulty and responsibility
- Representative of the organization's job structure
- Be susceptible to clear, concise job description

Key jobs or benchmarks are ranked by all members of a committee using this information as a basis for judgment. This will be done several different times to solidify their judgment.

This information will be incorporated into the final factor point system and all remaining positions will be evaluated against the final scale in the same manner.

Management shall evaluate final results, and a review system established as part of an ongoing refinement and updating process.

What is a "Generic" job description?

The adjective "generic" refers to a "kind, class or group". A "generic" job description is applied to a group of jobs. These jobs have sufficient similarities to allow them to be classed under one general title such as department chairman. Within a group of jobs with one generic title, there will be individual differences in responsibilities, size of assignment, etc. Every position represented would be expected to have some but not all of the generic responsibilities listed. Individual position would score factor points in an approximate range but probably not identical with the generic total.

Generic job descriptions:

. Will be used to compare general requirements and responsibilities of both old and new positions as part of an ongoing job classification system.

. Will not be used to advertize job openings or identify individual responsibilities and duties.

How does performance on the job affect level at which a job is classified?

. It doesn't! Jobs are classified according to the responsibilities placed on the job by management and how those relate to responsibilities placed on other jobs in the overall system.

How does job classification affect salary?

. Classification only indicates the salary range for a job.
. Where the job is placed on the range will depend on the results of a performance evaluation system which is forthcoming.
. What happens to incumbent's salary if job is placed on:

- a lower salary range?

  No salaries will be lowered as a result of this study. If salary is above the top of a range it would remain frozen until the range increased.

- a higher salary range?

  The salary will be placed no lower than the bottom of the range.

Where do we go from here?

If an employee feels that a mistake has been made in classification of employee's own job, employee should take the generic job description and the factor sheet and submit a memo stating reasons why she/he thinks the classification is incorrect.

Request should be forwarded through the supervisor to the executive officer who may reply to employee reaffirming the correctness of placement or submit to the factoring committee with his/her comments and a request for review.

Final decision will rest with the President.

The system will be subject to ongoing updating and refinement with periodic position reviews. These processes will be published in the procedures manual.

PROCESS USED TO DEVELOP PCC ADMINISTRATIVE JOB FACTORING SYSTEM

The process used to develop the attached system included the following steps:

1. Development, distribution, completion, review and validation by all supervisors through executive officers of Administrative Job Descriptions and Work Sheets.
2. Development of a factoring system including a factor tally sheet.

Each factor, such as education, experience and responsibility was assigned a weight by the President as a percentage of the total to correlate that characteristic with its relative value or worth to PCC. Examination of the Factor Tally Sheet (or the Factors themselves) shows the following weight assignments (or points):

	Weight Assignment		% of Total	
TOTAL		750		100
I. Education		100		13
II. Experience Total		150		20
A. Type	85		11	
B. Length	65		9	
III. Responsibility Total		500		67
A. Supervision	60		8	
B. Student Contacts	45		6	
C. Intra-college Contacts	40		5	
D. Outside College Contacts	45		6	
E. Financial Responsibility	60		8	
F. Instruction	80		11	
G. College Operations	60		8	
H. Management Decisions and Planning	60		8	
I. Presidential Assignment	50		7	

It should be noted that in most instances, positions include only some, but not all of the various components responsibilties listed. Consequently, the sum of the points assigned to the various components of these major factors may be greater than shown above; however, the above points are maximum weights for each major factor.

3. In addition, the President selected a number of positions at each level to be used as standards or benchmarks. Since he considered these specific positions to be correctly placed relative to each other, these positions were to be used as benchmarks against which all other positions can be compared.

4. President Anthony appointed the following factoring committee:

   Bill Dobson, Coordinator of Veteran Affairs
   Barbara Ellison, Director of Personnel
   Odessa Hendrix, Coordinator Research/Projects
   Roy Lindsay, Executive Dean
   Don Uppendahl, Associate Dean of Business and Industry
   Mickey Williamson, Director of Research & Planning

5. Each member of this committee factored, i.e., used the job description questionnaire, job description, the factoring system, directions for use, and tally sheet, independently for each of the benchmark positions. Subsequently, the committee met, reviewed these results, obtained additional information as necessary through resource documents or telephone inquiry and reached committee consensus.

6. Two outside authorities, Kirk Berger, of Local Government Personnel Institute (LPGI) and Arnold Quigley, Position Analyst of PGE agreed to critique the system in conference with President Anthony and the committee.

7. Subsequently, all full time positions which are currently filled (except any recently filled) were factored independently by at least three members of the committee. Many were factored by four, five or all committee member. Again, each position was reviewed in committee by those who had factored the position. Discussion continued until consensus was reached.

   At all times considerable effort was made to assure that the position and its responsibilities were being considered rather than the incumbent's qualifications and/or performance. The qualifications or performance of an incumbent have no bearing on how a job is to be factored. Qualification and performance of an incumbent is a part of performance evaluation which is a related, but separate item. In order to separate incumbent from the position, in many instances, much consideration was given to how a position would be advertised if it were to be refilled.

8. Job titles at the various levels were modified slightly to better describe the level of responsibility and to allow similar titles to be used at only two adjacent levels. Where titles are similar at two levels, i.e., Coordinator and Coordinator II, or Department Chair and Department Chair II, for example, the differences in the levels are a result of a combination of factors such as education and/or experience required along with deviations in responsibility, such as, size of budget and complexity of supervision.

9. Generic job descriptions were developed to correlate with the various groups of job responsibilities and their titles. They will be used as standards against which specific job descriptions developed in the future can be compared.

10. The results of the committee's factoring and generic job descriptions was presented to the President's cabinet for review and challenge by executive officers.

11. The committee met with each executive officer or representative who challenged the factoring of a position in his/her area. Relevant information was discussed. All committee members factored these positions and more discussion was held until consensus was again reached by the committee on each position.

12. The President reviewed the results of the entire process and determined the numerical "cuts" or lines to be drawn between the groups of positions at the various responsibility (or salary) levels.

13. Generic job descriptions were completed and reviewed for consistency with the finalized "cuts."

14. Results and a report was prepared for review by the cabinet and distribution to all administrators along with the notices of job level placement.

15. Any administrator who wishes to challenge the level of placement of his/her job should send reasons in writing to his/her executive officer by May 25.

16. Executive officer may answer or refer written challenge to committee who will review, research as necessary and respond in writing with copy to the President. Target date for completion is June 15, 1982.

17. Final resolution of challenges will rest with the President.

18. Procedures are being developed for the maintenance and review of the system on an on-going basis.

19. As a companion to this study, in late May, 1982, an Administrative Performance Evaluation instrument intended to be utilized this fiscal year should be ready for distribution. The job description each administrator previously prepared will be used in conjunction with this evaluation. Criteria for movement through the salary range of each job level classification will be keyed to evaluation of performance.

20. Procedures for on-going supervisor or employee initiated requests for job reclassification are being developed.

Portland Community College
12000 S.W. 49th Avenue Portland, Oregon 97219 (503)244-6111

From: Dr. John H. Anthony JHA

Date: January 13, 1982

To: Administrative Personnel

The Department of Research and Planning, through the office of the Vice President of Educational Services, has been charged with making a study of jobs and related salaries for Portland Community College administrators. The first step of this study is to develop job descriptions for existing jobs. The initial step of the process for developing these job descriptions is to have each administrator respond to an administrative job description work sheet for her/his own job.

The next step of the process is to write a job description for the position you are currently holding. This information should be as up-to-date as possible. Please do not use information from your previous job description unless it is applicable.

Remember, this is a job description, not a performance appraisal. When completing the form, look objectively at the qualifications. Education and experience do not have to reflect your current standing in those areas.

Minimum or entry-level information will be more useful. When writing the responsibilities, be specific. Use "action" words. The attached list of words may be of assistance to you.

Each person is to receive two copies of each form. One is a work copy and the other is the copy which should be typed and given to your immediate supervisor for review, comments or changes.

Please respond as accurately and thoroughly as you can.

IMPORTANT

All completed job descriptions and work sheets are to be returned to (CC 821) Odessa Hendrix by 1-25-82.

If there are any questions, please call Odessa Hendrix at Sylvania, x389.

JHA bb

COLLEGE BOARD: Carl Piacentini, Chairman • Howard Cherry • Bill A. Grenfell, Jr. • Bill Hamilton • Becky Mansfield • Lynda Mayo • Jeannette Saucy
PRESIDENT: John H. Anthony

JOB DESCRIPTION WORK SHEET: GUIDE FOR PREPARATION OF POSITION DESCRIPTION

As an employee of Portland Community College, you are aware that a current position description is important to both you and the college. Therefore, we are asking you to provide information which will accurately reflect your job.

The position description questionnaire is concerned with the duties and responsibilities of your job and not personal performance. The care and attention you direct in answering the following questions will help ensure accuracy of the job description.

Be careful and complete when describing the job. Write simply, take your time and stick to the facts.

In answering the following questions, you may assume that the reader will have a clear and total understanding of the activities and organization of the college.

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ADMINISTRATIVE JOB DESCRIPTION WORK SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Read carefully the entire questionnaire before answering any questions.
2. Type all answers.
3. Use extra paper if needed, numbering the answers to correspond with the questions.

Position Title _____

Incumbent _____

I. EDUCATION:

A. Required because of specific job requirements (i.e.) position includes teaching lower division college transfer courses, etc.

Degree: MS _____ BS _____ AA _____

Other licenses or certificates _____

Field _____

B. Generally indicated: (It is recognized that some individuals, because of reading, life experiences and independent study, qualify themselves without acquiring degrees; however, completion of the following course work would usually be required to qualify an individual).

Degree: PhD _____ MS _____ BS _____ AA _____

Other licenses or certificates _____

Field _____

C. Equivalents: May be substituted for above educational requirements.

1. Years of experience _____

2. Types of experience _____

_____

_____

_____

3. Other _____

_____

_____

II. EXPERIENCE: In addition to education, the following work experience would be required to perform the job:

Type of Experience	Years of Experience

III. POSITION RESPONSIBILITY

A. SUPERVISION

1. Position title of immediate supervisor.

2. Number and position titles of those persons supervised directly. (Indicate whether full, part time).

3. Number and position titles of those supervised indirectly. (Indicate whether full or part time).

B. STUDENT CONTACT

1. Approximate number of students with whom employee has contact each term:

FTE _____ or Headcount _____

Type of Contact: Instruction _____ Counseling _____

Advising _____ Registration _____

Other:

2. Approximate student contact for all employees under direct supervision:

FTE _____ or Headcount _____

Type of Contact: Instruction _____ Counseling _____

Advising _____ Registration _____

Other:

C. INTRA-COLLEGE CONTACTS

1. List names of departments worked with during a term:

2. Number of administrators worked with on a weekly basis.

1. President _____
2. Vice President _____
3. Executive Dean _____
4. Associate Dean _____
5. Director _____

3. Describe the nature of these contacts.

D. OUTSIDE COLLEGE CONTACTS

1. List names of businesses or other institutions contacted during a term:

2. Describe the nature of these contacts.

3. What is the result to PCC of these contacts? Detail.

E. FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

1. College Budget

a. Approximate amount of budget directly responsible for

$ _____

b. What is responsibility for monitoring, reporting and authorizing expenditures?

2. College Income

a. Is position responsible for obtaining outside funding for College? If so, detail and estimate amount processed during a fiscal year.

b. Is position responsible for monitoring and verifying receipt of usual income sources? If so, detail and estimate amount processed during a fiscal year.

F. RESPONSIBILITY FOR INSTRUCTION

1. List names of programs or general subject areas position supervises and indicate whether direct or indirect supervision:

Subject Area	Type of Supervision

2. Briefly state responsibility for ongoing curriculum and course content.

3. State responsibility for new program content and development.

4. State responsibility for monitoring and reporting instructional information.

a. Instructor approval to teach

b. Course approval

G. RESPONSIBILITY FOR COLLEGE OPERATIONS

1. What responsibility does this position have for delivery of services (Capital Expenditure/ Food Services/ Plant Operations/ Bookstore/ Purchasing, etc.)? Detail.

2. What responsibility does this position have for checking or monitoring work of other departments? Detail. (Indicate source of data).

3. What responsibility does this position have for data collection and report preparation to meet college, state and federal requirements? Detail. (Indicate source of data).

H. RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGEMENT DECISIONS AND PLANNING

1. Is this a cabinet level position?

2. Detail responsibility for participating in collective bargaining.

3. What impact does this position have on College's planning for the future.

IV. GENERAL DUTIES

Briefly list major responsibilities, duties and activities of this position:

Reviewed by immediate supervisor _____(Initial)

Date _____

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

JOP TITLE: _____

RESPONSIBLE TO: _____

AUTHORIZED BY: _____

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Experience:

RESPONSIBILITIES:

Reviewed by immediate supervisor _____(Initial)

Date _____

HELPFUL TERMINOLOGY FOR ANALYZING JOBS AND PREPARING JOB DESCRIPTIONS

Action Words:

accounts for	details	lifts	repairs
acts	determines	maintains	requests
adjusts	directs	makes	reworks
analyzes	discovers	manipulates	reviews
answers	drafts	marks	schedules
applies	drives	mixes	secures
approves	estimates	observes	selects
arranges	examines	obtains	sells
assigns	figures	operates	sets
assists	files	orders	settles
cares for	finds	organizes	sits
carries	follows	performs	sketches
checks	formulates	places	stamps
cleans up	gauges	plans	stands
climbs	handles	prepares	stores
compares	inspects	processes	supervises
composes	installs	proposes	systematizes
computes	instructs	pulls	takes
conducts	interprets	pushes	teaches
constructs	investigates	reads	totals
controls	issues	receives	types
coordinates	itemizes	recognizes	uses
decides	judges	records	walks
designates	keeps	refers	works
designs	lays out	removes	writes

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ADMINISTRATIVE JOB FACTORS

POSITION TITLE: _____

I. EDUCATION OR TRAINING (100)

SPECIAL TRAINING OR CERTIFICATE OR ASSOCIATE DEGREE		AA OR AS OR AAS PLUS SPECIAL LICENSE OR CERTIFICATE	BA OR BS	MA OR MS	PH.D.
POINTS	25	35	50	75	100

_____

II. EXPERIENCE (150)

A. TYPE (85)

	TYPE	MANAGEMENT			
		NONE	(1) LOW LEVEL	MID RANGE	UPPER LEVEL
EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS OR INSTRUCTIONAL	Outside Education		65	75	85
	OTHER Education	45	55	65	75
	COM. COL. OR HIGHER ED	55	65	75	85

OR

OR

NONMANAGEMENT BUS/INDUSTRY/ TRADES/SKILLS	0	25	40	65

_____

B. YEARS (65)

FACTORS	LESS THAN 2	2 TO 4	5 OR MORE
POINTS	20	50	65

_____

(1) LOW LEVEL: FIRST LINE SUPERVISOR/TECHNICAL SPECIALIST

A. SUPERVISION (60)

CONVERSION RATIOS FOR SUPERVISION PART TO FULL TIME HEAD COUNT	ADMINISTRATORS	FACULTY	CLASSIFIED
PART-TIME HEAD COUNT	2	3	4
FULL TIME HEAD COUNT	1	1	1

	DIRECT	FULL TIME HEAD COUNT			
COUNT	ADMINISTRATORS	1 - 2	3 - 5	6 OR MORE	
	FACULTY	1 - 10	11 - 33	34 OR MORE	
	CLASSIFIED	1 - 3	4 - 14	15 OR MORE	
POINTS	ADMINISTRATORS	6	8	10	( )
	FACULTY	5	7	9	( )
	CLASSIFIED	3	6	8	( )

	INDIRECT	FULL TIME HEAD COUNT			
COUNT	ADMINISTRATORS	1 - 3	4 - 8	9 OR MORE	
	FACULTY	1 - 50	51 - 175	176 OR MORE	
	CLASSIFIED	1 - 15	16 - 30	30 OR MORE	
POINTS	ADMINISTRATORS	3	4	5	( )
	FACULTY	3	4	5	( )
	CLASSIFIED	2	3	4	( )

TOTAL DIRECT + INDIRECT POINTS
(A + B + C + D + E + F) = ( )

	OVERALL COMPLEXITY		
	STANDARDIZED DIRECTION SEMI-ROUTINE	GENERALLY DEFINED REQUIRES PLANNING UPDATING	ABSTRACTLY DEFINED REQUIRES ORIGINALITY, INNOVATING
POINTS (G) OVER 18	30	45	60
11 - 18	20	30	45
1 - 10	10	20	30

B. STUDENT CONTACT (45)

	DIRECT	FTE OR HEADS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS (1 TO 7 RATIO)				
			1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	OVER 20
			1-35	36-70	71-105	106-140	OVER 140
TYPE	DELIVERING INSTRUCTION, SPECIALIZED OR TECHNICAL SUPPORT		10	15	20	30	40
TYPE	SEMI-ROUTINE SERVICE ORIENTED		5	10	15	20	25
TYPE	GENERAL INFORMATION		1	2	3	4	5

	INDIRECT	FTE OR HEADS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS				
			1-50	51-100	101-500	501-1000	1001 OR MORE
			1-350	351-700	701-3500	3501-7000	7001 OR MORE
TYPE	DELIVERING INSTRUCTION SPECIALIZED OR TECHNICAL SUPPORT		10	15	25	35	45
TYPE	SEMI-ROUTINE SERVICE ORIENTED		5	10	15	20	30

B MAX = 45

C. INTRA-COLLEGE CONTACTS (40)

	NUMBER OF DEPARTMENTS PER TERM	COMPLEXITY		
		SEMI-ROUTINE GENERAL	REQUIRES DISSEMINATING OR OBTAINING SPECIALIZED OR TECHNICAL INFO	REQUIRES COORDINATION OR COMPLEX PROBLEM SOLVING
POINTS	OWN DIVISION PLUS SERVICE	3	6	9
POINTS	CAMPUS PLUS SERVICE	5	10	15
POINTS	COLLEGEWIDE	10	20	30

WEEKLY MANAGEMENT LEVEL CONTACTS	
AT LEAST 1 ASSOCIATE DEANS OR DIRECTORS	AT LEAST 2 CONTACTS AMONG PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, OR EXECUTIVE DEAN
5	10

POINTS

D. OUTSIDE COLLEGE CONTACTS (45)

		COMPLEXITY		
	RESULTS AFFECT	SEMI-ROUTINE GENERAL	REQUIRES DISSEMINATING OR OBTAINING SPECIALIZED OR TECHNICAL INFO	REQUIRES COORDINATION OR COMPLEX PROBLEM SOLVING
POINTS	DEPARTMENT	5	10	15
	DIVISION OR CAMPUS	10	15	30
	COLLEGEWIDE	15	30	45

E. FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (60)

1. BUDGET (30)

SIZE	DEGREE OF RESPONSIBILITY		
	MONITORING ONLY	SHARED DEPARTMENT DIVISION	SIGN OFF AND FINAL RESPONSIBILITY
UNDER $50,000	3	4	—
$50,000 TO $99,999	6	8	—
$100,000 TO $499,999	9	12	15
$500,000 TO $999,999	12	16	20
$1,000,000 OR OVER	15	20	30

2. COLLEGE INCOME (50)

A) OUTSIDE FUNDING (30)

	AMOUNT	RESPONSIBILITY	
		SHARED	WRITER OR NEGOTIATOR
POINTS	$10,000 TO $50,000	5	10
	$50,001 TO $100,000	10	20
	OVER $100,000	15	30

B) USUAL INCOME SOURCES (20)

	AMOUNT	ACCOUNTABILITY OF THIS POSITION		
		LOW	MODERATE	PRIMARY
POINTS	UNDER $50,000	4	8	12
	$50,001 TO $499,999	8	12	16
	$500,000 OR MORE	12	16	20

(MAX E = 60)

F. RESPONSIBILITY FOR INSTRUCTION (80)

1. SUBJECT AREA AND SUPERVISION (35)

No. OF PROGRAMS		DIRECTLY SUPERVISED			
		0	1-2	3-5	6 OR MORE
INDIRECTLY SUPERVISED	0	0	20	26	32
	1-5	20	28	31	33
	6-15	28	30	32	34
	16 OR MORE	35	35	35	35

2. CURRICULUM AND COURSE CONTENT (15)

	DEGREE OF RESPONSIBILITY		
	REVIEW	SHARED	PRIMARY
POINTS	5	10	15

3. NEW PROGRAM CONTENT AND DEVELOPMENT (15)

	DEGREE OF RESPONSIBILITY		
	REVIEW	SHARED	PRIMARY
POINTS	5	10	15

4. MONITORING AND REPORTING INSTRUCTIONAL INFORMATION (15)

	REVIEW & SIGNATURE	COLLEGEWIDE MONITORING & REPORTING ONLY	BOTH
INSTRUCTOR APPROVAL TO TEACH ONLY	3	12	
COURSE APPROVAL ONLY	3	12	12
BOTH	6		15

G. RESPONSIBILITY FOR COLLEGE OPERATIONS (60)

1. DELIVERY OF SERVICES (CAPITAL EXPENDITURE/FOOD SERVICES/PAYROLL/PERSONNEL/PLANT OPERATIONS/BOOKSTORE/PURCHASING/ AUDIO VISUAL/ IMC) (60)

	COMPLEXITY AND MAGNITUDE		
	BASIC	MEDIUM	HIGH
DIVISION, CAMPUS OR CENTER	10	20	40
COLLEGEWIDE	20	40	60

2. CHECKING OR MONITORING WORK OF OTHER DEPARTMENTS (40)

	REMOTE	SHARED	PRIMARY
DEPARTMENT LEVEL	5	10	20
DIVISION OR CAMPUS	10	20	30
COLLEGEWIDE	20	30	40

3. DATA COLLECTION AND REPORT PREPARATION (20)

	COLLECT	VERIFY ANALYZE	INTERPRET SUBMIT
INTERNAL	5	10	
EXTERNAL	5	10	
BOTH	10	20	

G MAX = 60

H. MANAGEMENT DECISIONS AND PLANNING (60)

1. CABINET LEVEL (25)

YES
25

2. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING/ CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION (20)

	NO. OF B.U. EMPLOYEES SUPV'D.		
	2-5	6-20	21 OR MORE
DIRECT SUPERVISION OF BARGAINING UNIT EMPL.	2	8	15

	DEPT.	DIV/CAMP	COLLEGEWIDE
CONTRACT CONTENT, PROBLEM SOLVING, INTERPRETATION, OR GRIEVANCE	5	15	20

3. IMPACT ON PLANNING FOR FUTURE (25)

	DEPART-MENT	DIVISION OR CAMPUS	COLLEGEWIDE
SOME	5	10	15
MODERATE	10	15	20
CONSIDERABLE	15	20	25

MAX H = 60

I. PRESIDENTIAL ASSIGNMENT: (50)

POSITION REGULARLY GIVEN UNIQUE OR HIGHLY COMPLEX ASSIGNMENTS OUTSIDE OF THE SCOPE OF GENERIC JOB DESCRIPTION AND NOT OTHERWISE ADDRESSED IN FACTORING SYSTEM.
POINTS TO BE ASSIGNED BY PRESIDENT.

Portland Community College
Instructions for Use of Administrative Job Factors

I. Education is to be evaluated as shown in B in the questionnaire, generally indicated since advertisements for positions will use this as the preferred education. Select only the highest appropriate number.

If equivalent experience is to be considered, committee will evaluate below baccalaureate level.

Guidelines: Executive deans and vice presidents, Ph.D. or equivalent preferred; associate deans, most directors and instructional department administrators, Masters.

II. Experience

A. Type. Only one number is to be selected from either the first table or the second. Two factors are shown in the first table. Choose the number which coincides best in both respects to the questionnaire or use the second table for nonmanagement experience requirements. Select only the highest appropriate number.

III. Responsibility

A. Supervision:
- First convert any part time staff listed according to the conversion table.
- Then select either 0 or the appropriate number of points for lines A, B, C, D, E, and F corresponding to the number of full time head counts for administrators, faculty and classified staff supervised.
- G should equal the sum of A, B, C, D, E and F.
- Use G to find the appropriate line in the table at the bottom of page 2 along with the overall complexity of the supervision provided to choose the actual points to be used for supervision. (A, B, C, D, E, F and G are not included in the total points.)
- In general, the overall complexity of supervision which either includes instruction, administrators or combination of diverse services is to be considered more complex.

B. Student Contact: Select either 0 or the appropriate figure for the majority of the contacts from one each of the direct or indirect groups.

C. Intra-College Contacts: Use items III C 1 and 3 of the questionnaire to select the appropriate number from the upper table. Job titles which include Rock Creek, Cascade, College Centers or Sylvania (except for executive deans) should usually be considered

as limited to a campus. Divisional limitation should be considered for 3 associate deans: Business and Industry, Social Science and Communication, and Sciences and Health. Own "Division and Service" can include a few departments outside own division if small or same discipline, e.g. Nursing, Rock Creek; Cascade, Business Ed.

Use item III C 2 of the questionnaire for selecting the correct points from the lower table.

D. Outside College Contacts: Select 0 or the appropriate number of points.

E. Financial Responsibility:

1. Budget Column 3 is to be used only for 2 vice presidents, 4 executive deans and 1 dean of students. Do not combine monitoring and shared points.

2. College Income

a) Outside funding: Choose 0 or the appropriate number.

b) Usual income sources: Choose 0 or the appropriate number.

F. Responsibility for Instruction:

1. Subject Area and Supervision: The identity of most programs to be counted can be seen on the attached excerpt from the budget. Some additional breakdown of large areas is required such as: Social Science, Anthropology, Economics, History, Psychology, etc. Select the appropriate number.

2. Curriculum and Course Content: In general, department administrators either chairs or coordinators have primary responsibility, associate deans shared responsibility, and executive deans review. Select 0 or the appropriate number.

3. Similar to 2 above.

4. Monitoring and Reporting Instructional Information: In general, department administrators fall in column 1, associate deans (Curriculum Council) on the diagonal, and service oriented staff the middle column. Choose 0 or the appropriate number.

G. Responsibility for College Operations: Choose 0 or the appropriate number from each table.

The original questionnaire did not reflect delivery of services. This omission has been corrected. Delivery of services excludes instruction and student support services. Decision whether responsibility is of basic, medium or high complexity level is based on how delivery or lack of delivery and employees' responsibility for seeing service is delivered affects ability of campus or college to continue to operate at a satisfactory level.

H. Management Decisions and Planning:

1. Collective Bargaining/Contract Administration

   a. All persons who supervise 2 FTE or more full time faculty or half or full time classified staff (bargaining unit) should be given the appropriate number of points for bargaining unit employee supervision.

   b. The appropriate numbers should be selected for each of the two lines shown.

2. Impact on Planning:

   In general, planning impact will be evaluated as follows:

Service		Instruction	
A - B	0	A	0 - 5
C	10 - 15	B	5 - 10
D	10 - 20	C	10
E	15 - 25	D	10
F	15 - 25	E	15
G	25	F	20
		G	25

I. Presidential Assignment:

   Points to be assigned only by the President.

   Occasional special assignments would be considered during evaluation process and not as a part of job level placement.

Lastly, it should be noted that there are two major lines of administrators: Instruction and Service. In several instances the total sum of the total possible points within an area is greater than the total possible for the area since an "or" situation usually exists. However, in all instances no more than the maximums noted should be entered on the tally sheets.

TABLE II

SUMMARY OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT (FTE) BY PROGRAM
1981-82

Airframe & Power Technology	191.7
Apprenticeship & Trade Extension	491.7
Architectural Drafting	181.8
Art (Labs and Survey)	192.9
Auto Body Technology	126.6
Automotive Technology	279.6
Building Construction Technology	151.9
Business Education	739.0
Community Education	1372.5
Computer Field Service Technology	-
Data Processing	471.4
Dental Programs	135.8
Developmental Education	1993.9
Diesel Technology	216.7
Educational Travel	20.0
Electronic Engineering Technology	250.0
Electronic Service Technology	67.4
Engineering Technology	258.3
Government Services Program	262.9
Graphic Arts Technology (Commercial Art, Photo, Journalism)	320.9
Health Records Program	86.0
Home Economics	137.4
Hospitality Programs	162.3
Humanities	5.0
Industrial Drafting	217.1
Instructional Technology	239.2
Landscape Technology	108.9
Language Arts	1451.4
Life Sciences	413.3
Machine Technology	222.4
Management Services	522.3
Mathematics	494.6
Medical Lab. & Veterinary Science	102.0
Music	88.7
Nursing Programs	300.0
Optical Technology	35.8
Physical Education	338.6
Physical Science	259.9
Professional Crafts	83.5
Radio, TV, Speech and Drama	248.7
Radiologic Technology	118.7
Small Engine Technology	56.7
Social Sciences	1076.0
Welding Technology	237.8
Total	14,731.3

(Excludes Cooperative Education, Treaty Oak, Indochinese Relief Program and Clusters)

FACTOR TALLY SHEET

POSITION TITLE: _____ TOTAL = _____

I. EDUCATION (100) _____

II. EXPERIENCE (150) _____

A. TYPE (85) _____

B. LENGTH (65) _____

III. RESPONSIBILITY 500 _____

A. SUPERVISION (60) _____

___ + ___ + ___ = ___
A B C

___ + ___ + ___ = ___ . ___
D E F G

(CONVERT)

B. STUDENT CONTACT (45) MAX

___ + ___ = _____

C. INTRA-COLLEGE CONTACTS (40)

___ + ___ = _____

D. OUTSIDE COLLEGE CONTACTS (45) _____

E. FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (60) MAX _____

1. BUDGET (30) _____

2. COLLEGE INCOME (50) _____

A. OUTSIDE FUNDING (30) _____

B. USUAL INCOME SOURCES (20) _____

F. RESPONSIBILITY FOR INSTRUCTION (80) _____

1. SUBJECT AREA & SUPERVISION (35) _____

2. CURRICULUM & COURSE CONTENT (15) _____

3. NEW PROGRAM CONTENT & DEVELOPMENT (15) _____

4. MONITORING & REPORTING INSTRUCTIONAL INFORMATION (15) _____

G. RESPONSIBILITY FOR COLLEGE OPERATIONS (60) MAX. _____

1. DELIVERY OF SERVICES (60) _____

2. CHECKING OR MONITORING WORK OF OTHER DEPARTMENTS OR DELIVERY SERVICES (40) _____

3. DATA COLLECTION & REPORT PREP. (20) _____

H. MANAGEMENT DECISIONS & PLANNING (60) MAX. _____

1. CABINET LEVEL (25) _____

2. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING (20) MAX. _____

___ + ___ = _____

3. IMPACT ON PLANNING FOR FUTURE (25) _____

I. Presidential Assignment (50) Max.

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PORTLAND, OREGON

Portland General Electric Company

MAR 2 1982

February 24, 1982

Ms. Barbara Ellison
Director of Personnel Services
Portland Community College
12000 SW 49th
Portland, OR 97219

Dear Barbara:

As a follow-up to our February 19, 1982 critique of PCC's point factor system for administrative positions, I would like to provide the committee with some summary remarks.

1. The evaluation system that you have developed appears to address all significant factors PCC considers relevant to awarding compensation to administrative positions. Compared to a "Hay" point factor system your system addresses "know how" in education and experience factors and "problem solving"/"accountability" in various responsibility factors.

2. The PCC system appears to be reasonably efficient and useable for evaluating relative magnitudes of administrative positions. I recommend the committee use the system to evaluate all of the 140 PCC administrative positions prior to making any significant changes. Based upon this experience, the committee will be better able to evaluate the need for adjustments, if any, to the specific factors and/or their relative weights.

3. If inequities become prevalent for awarding points to service jobs versus instructional jobs, I recommend that you develop an additional section of factors that can be used to award points to jobs which are "exceptions," in much the same way "working conditions" factors are used in the "Hay" system for adding points for jobs involving physical hazzards or strain.

4. Each position should be independently evaluated by at least three committee members with the consensus point totals endorsed by the entire committee (most "Hay" evaluation committees use no less than five evaluators for each position). I recommend that the PCC Committee

be composed of persons who have broad knowledge of most positions being evaluated and whose current position is at about the same or greater point level as the positions being evaluated.

5. An appeal process should be made available for persons presenting reasonable evidence that a position has received an inequitable evaluation.

6. Disclosure of information to employees regarding the evaluation process is a matter of management judgement. It is usually prudent to provide general information about principals upon which the system is based and how the process is used to provide internal equity. I recommend that PCC avoid disclosing information regarding specific committee members' evaluations or their discussions leading to consensus.

It has been a pleasure to participate in the critique of PCC's position evaluation system. The suggestions and comments I have provided represent my professional opinions and are not necessarily representative of Portland General Electric Company or Hay and Assoicates. Please feel free to contact me if I can be of further service.

Sincerely,

Arnold Quigley
Position Analysis, Compensation
Portland General Electric Co.

AQ:th

LGPI 1201 Court Street N.E. • P.O. Box 908 • Salem, Oregon 97308 • Phone (503) 588-2251
LOCAL GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL INSTITUTE

March 10, 1982

Barbara Ellison
Personnel Director
Portland Community College
12000 SW 49th
Portland, Oregon 97219

Dear Barbara:

As a follow-up to our meeting in February to critique PCC's point factor job evaluation system, I would like to summarize the comments I made. Overall, I believe the committee has developed a very workable system that is consistent with the established principles of point factor approaches.

My experience with all types of job evaluation systems and a number of agencies has shown me that the most critical issue is timely implementation. Because of the effort that has gone into your project to date, I believe it is ready for implementation without further extensive refinements.

However, before commencing the monumental task of evaluating all jobs, I encourage you to insure that the system is understood and accepted by all top administrative officials. Questions about the point factor approach, the factors used and the weights assigned should be resolved prior to the evaluation of jobs so that the appeal process, that is essential, will focus only on the evaluation and of points assigned to a specific job. If the appeal process becomes a forum for questioning the validity of the system, its ultimate implementation may be seriously jeopardized.

I suggest expanding the evaluation committee to include representation from all current levels of management personnel. Also each job should be evaluated by at least two members of the committee and preferably by three members.

As previously noted, an appeal process is essential. Appeals should be on a request basis from the appropriate Dean. Some effort should be made to resolve questions about the evaluations short of a formal appeal. The appeals should specify the points of the evaluation that are questioned by the employee and Dean. I suggest that all formal appeals be received by the committee prior to any hearings so that the committee may review them for any patterns of concerns. The full committee should constitute the appeal body.

I also suggest that before releasing the study results, the committee review the overall ranking of all jobs to identify and correct any apparent significant deviations from the rankings that might have been projected based on existing knowledge of the management positions. This is a delicate process because you won't want to defeat a major purpose of the point-factor system which is to obtain a more objective ranking of positions. However, the credibility and acceptance of the system will be improved if any obvious errors in evaluation can be alleviated before all management staff review the recommendations.

43

During the refinement phase the factors and their weighting should be reviewed to insure that they don't bias the evaluation of certain job groups. Obviously the purpose of the system is to document differences among jobs but the point matrix for a specific factor, such as head count supervised, could disproportionately value the responsibility level of some jobs--either upward or downward.

As both Arnold and I said, however, your system is basically very sound and this type of fine tuning should be undertaken after the system is in place rather than prior to its use.

As we discussed, the traditional Hay and Willis point factor systems rate jobs against knowledge, accountability (responsibility) and mental demands (problem solving, independent judgment). In their systems these are mutually exclusive evaluations. I observed in your system that some of the factors, such as staff supervision, evaluate an accountability factor against a problem solving factor. I don't know that this creates a problem but it might result in a qualitative problem solving factor being unduly influenced by a quantitative factor such as number of people supervised. Again, any potential negative impact can probably be assessed once the system is in place.

In the refinement phase you may also want to evaluate whether you have the proper mix of responsibility and problem solving factors. It appears that the present list of job factors is weighted in favor of responsibility factors.

On another issue, you may want to evaluate the impact of placing maximum point values on certain factors which are less than the cumulative total of sub-factors (i.e., financial responsibility has a maximum of 60 points, but the sub-factors of budget [30 points] and college income [50 points] total 80 points). This will have a tendency to compress the point values of jobs at the top levels, which could distort the overall relationship among those positions.

I believe these comments pretty well cover the major points I raised in the meeting. Barbara, I certainly enjoyed the opportunity to assist the committee in reviewing your system. It was a learning experience for me, too. If I can be of any further assistance or clarify the comments in this letter, please contact me.

Good luck with the implementation and sometime let's discuss how your efforts might be shared with other community colleges.

Best regards,

Kirk Berger
Director

plw

Generic
Level A

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

JOB TITLE Supervisor II/Specialist II/Technician II & Assistant

RESPONSIBLE TO A higher level administrator

AUTHORIZED BY President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The SupervisorII,Specialist II,Technician II or Assistant is responsible to higher level administrator for assistance in or operation of a departmental service, for technical support, or function of a defined and routine nature which would include but is not limited to Cooperative Education, tutor service, administrative assistance, job development, central storeroom services or electronic services.

QUALIFICATIONS

Education:

Two to four years of college education leading to a degree or equivalent advanced training.

Experience:

Two to four years of low to mid-level experience in non-management business, industry, or trade or one to four years of non-management or low level management experience in education.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Provide assistance in or operation of a departmental service and/or technical support for delivery of service and day to day operations.

2. Provide support service for students, instructors, administrative staff, and other college departments. Participate in on-going evaluation and upgrading of service and identification of problem areas.

3. Communicate with college staff, student business, education, industry, and/or the general public in the area of responsibility to facilitate the effective operation of the service and identify and respond to department needs.

4. Assist supervisor in report preparation, record keeping, planning and other duties as assigned.

Generic
Level B

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

JOB TITLE: Supervisor/Specialist/Technician

RESPONSIBLE TO: Executive Officer, Dean, Department Chair, Director or Coordinator

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The Supervisor, Specialist or Technician is responsible to an executive officer, Dean, Department Chair, Director, or Coordinator for departmental services, technical support or function of a defined and generally routine nature which would include but is not limited to payroll, campus safety, custodial, financial aid, computer operations, apprentice, bi-cultural services or audio-visual services.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Bachelor's degree or equivalent. Emphasis in area in which specific background is required.

Experience:

Two to four years of low to mid-level experience in non-management business, industry or trade or one to four years of low-level management experience in education.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Provide supervision and/or technical expertise required for delivery of service and day to day operations.

2. Provide support service for students, instructors, administrative staff and other college departments. Participate in ongoing evaluation and upgrading of service and identification of problem areas and departmental problem solving.

3. Communicate with college staff, student business, education, industry and/or the general public in the area of responsibility to facilitate the effective operation of the department and identify and respond to department needs.

4. Assist Executive Officer, Dean, Director or Coordinator in report preparation, record keeping, planning, budget control and other duties as assigned.

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

Generic
Level C

JOB TITLE: (Services) Coordinator (II)/Manager (II)

RESPONSIBLE TO: Executive Officer, Dean or Director

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The Services Coordinator or Manager II is directly responsible to an executive officer, dean or director for coordination or management of a college or campus service, department or function which would include but is not limited to college records, registration, veterans services, staff development, media processing, payroll, personnel, custodial or risk management services.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Bachelor's degree or equivalent. Emphasis in area in which specific background or training is required.

Experience:

Five or more years mid to high level experience in nonmanagement business, industry or trade or 2-4 years of low level management, education or community college experience.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

Coordinate or manage a department, service or function which would include some but not all of the following:

1. Provide coordination, management and/or technical expertise required for delivery of service, day to day operation and financial accountability.

2. Coordinate support services for students, instructors, and administrative staff with other college departments. Participate in ongoing evaluation and upgrading of service, identification of problem areas and intra-college problem solving.

3. Communicate with college staff, business, education, industry, and/or the general community in the area of responsibility to facilitate the effective operation of the college and identify and respond to needs.

4. Assist executive officer, dean or director in report preparation, record keeping, planning, budget control and other duties as assigned.

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

Generic
Level D

JOB TITLE: Coordinator, Community Services

RESPONSIBLE TO: Executive Dean

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The Coordinator, Community Services, is directly responsible to an Executive Dean for administration of the Community Services Program throughout a geographical area of the College District.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Bachelor's degree or equivalent.

Experience:

Two to four years management or administrative experience.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

May include the following:

1. Personnel administration of program.
2. Preparation of
   a. Class schedules for instruction
   b. Budget and its monitoring
   c. Requisitions and employment authorizations
3. Program and curriculum evaluation and development.
4. Instructor approvals.
5. Instructor and classified staff evaluation.
6. Comply with collective bargaining contracts.
7. Supervision of Area Community Service registration process.

4-29-82

AA

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

Generic
Level D

JOB TITLE: (Services) Coordinator/Manager

RESPONSIBLE TO: Executive Officer, Dean or Director

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The Services Coordinator or Manager is directly responsible to a Vice President, Executive Dean, Dean or Director for collegewide management or coordination of a service area which could include but is not limited to the food service, business office, high school relations, college activities, instructional program planning and development, accounting services, bookstores, emergency medical, handicapped, testing or general student and instructional support services or drop-in centers.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Bachelor's degree or equivalent required in most areas. A Master's degree or equivalent is required in areas dealing with curriculum, handicapped or special student services and related areas.

Experience:

Five or more years of high level experience in nonmanagement business, industry or trade, or two years of low-level management, community college or university experience.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

Coordinate or manage a collegewide service area which would include some but not all of the following:

1. Coordinate support services for instructional program planning, course development and approval, or student special needs.

2. Provide coordination, management and technical expertise for delivery of services, day to day operation, and financial accountability.

3. Communicate with college staff, business, industry, education, and/or the general community in the area of responsibility to facilitate the effective operation of the college and identify and respond to needs.

4. Assist executive officer, dean or director in planning, budget control, report preparation, and other duties as assigned.

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

GENERIC
LEVEL D

JOB TITLE: DEPARTMENT CHAIR (II)

RESPONSIBLE TO: Associate Dean

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The Department Chairperson is directly responsible to an Associate Dean for administration of one or more small instructional programs.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Bachelor's degree or equivalent specialized, trade or industrial training in one of the areas supervised.

Experience:

Two to four years management or administrative experience plus at least three years teaching.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

May include the following:

1. Personnel administration of department or program.
2. Prepares department:
   a. class schedules for instruction
   b. schedules for advising
   c. budget and monitors it
   d. requisitions and employment authorizations
3. Program and curriculum evaluation and development
4. Instructor approvals
5. Instructor and classified staff evaluation
6. Textbook orders to college bookstore
7. Advises students and evaluation of transcripts
8. Advisory Committee selection and meetings
9. Approval of petitions for graduation
10. Program accreditation
11. Comply with collective bargaining contracts

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

GENERIC
LEVEL E

JOB TITLE: DEPARTMENT CHAIR

RESPONSIBLE TO: Associate Dean

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The department chairperson is directly responsible to an Associate Dean for administration of one or more large instructional programs offered at one or more campuses, centers, or off-campus.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Master's degree or bacherlor's plus trade or industrial training in one of the areas supervised.

Experience:

2-4 years management or administrative experience plus at least three years teaching.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

May include the following:

1. Personnel administration of department or program.

2. Prepares department:

   a. class schedules for instruction
   b. schedules for advising
   c. budget and monitors it
   d. requisitions and employment authorizations

3. Program and curriculum evaluation and development
4. Instructor approvals
5. Instructor and classified staff evaluation
6. Textbook orders to college bookstore
7. Advises students and evaluation of transcripts
8. Advisory Committee selection and meetings
9. Approval of petitions for graduation.
10. Program accreditation
11. Comply with collective bargaining contracts
12. Facilities

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

Generic
Level E

JOB TITLE: (Services) Director - II

RESPONSIBLE TO: Executive Officer, Dean or Director

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The Services Director (II) is directly responsible to an executive officer, dean or director for collegewide administration of one or more service areas which provide instructional, student or administrative support services. The director may coordinate instructional courses compatible with service areas.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Master's degree or equivalent. Emphasis placed on areas in which specific expertise is required such as business or educational administration, library science.

Experience:

Five or more years experience in lower level management/instruction in community college, education, business or industry.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

Administration of a collegewide service area which would include some if not all of the following:

1. Provide general management, leadership and assistance required for collegewide delivery of services.

2. Coordinate with instructional areas to assist staff and students in best use of support services and facilities which would include one or more of the following: libraries, financial aid, career guidance, job placement.

3. Communicate with college staff, business, education, industry and/or the general community in the area of responsibility to facilitate the effective operation of the college and identify and respond to needs.

4. Assist the President or executive officers in long range planning, management information, report preparation, evaluation, business services, budget development and control, problem solving and other duties as assigned.

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

Level E

JOB TITLE: Director II, District Relations

RESPONSIBLE TO: President

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

Director II, District Relations is directly responsible to the President for administration of public relations for the college and coordination of internal communications.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Master's degree or equivalent with emphasis in communication, journalism or related field.

Experience:

Two to four years in lower level management in newspaper, radio, television, public relations, advertising and/or higher education.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Supervise PBX, information centers, media relations, publications, speaker's bureau, mailing lists, internal communications and promotional events.
2. Act as liaison to the state legislature.
3. Administrate District Relations Department.
4. Assist the President or executive officers in policy development and long range planning for curricular and facility needs through participation in the President's Cabinet and other duties as assigned by the President.

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

Level E

JOB TITLE: Director II, Human Resources

RESPONSIBLE TO: President

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The Director II, Human Resources is directly responsible to the President for administration of human resource activities and organizational development of the college.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Master's degree or equivalent with emphasis in education, personnel administration, social sciences, or related area.

Experience:

Two to four years lower level management or administrative experience in personnel, employee relations, affirmative action or related areas.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Supervise college activities related to affirmative action, collective bargaining and contract administration, employee complaints and grievances, and staff and organizational development.
2. Administer Department of Human Resources.
3. Assist the President or executive officers in policy development and long range planning for curricular and facility needs through participation in the President's Cabinet and other duties as assigned by the President.

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

Level E

JOB TITLE: Director II, Institute for Community Assistance

RESPONSIBLE TO: President

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The Director II, Institute for Community Assistance is directly responsible to the President for contracts and agreements related to educational services for business, industry and public agencies.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Master's degree or equivalent with emphasis in business, educational administration or related area.

Experience:

Two to four years in lower level management in education or business or industry.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Supervise college contracts and agreements with business and industry related to educational services for business, industry and public agencies.
2. Orient college staff to their role in responding to needs of business, industry and public agencies.
3. Administer activities and department of Institute of Community Assistance.
4. Assist the President or executive officers in policy development and long range planning for curricular and facility needs through participation in the President's Cabinet and other duties as assigned by the President

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

JOB TITLE: Associate Dean — F Level / Generic

RESPONSIBLE TO: Executive Dean

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The Associate Dean is directly responsible to the Executive Dean for supervision of all instructional programs on a campus or center or for a large Sylvania-based division. The Associate Dean assists the campus Dean in administration and coordination of operations with central services.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Master's Degree or equivalent required with emphasis on graduate level course work in Management, Public or School Administration.

Experience:

Five or more years of management or administration of educational programs or activities at Community College or equivalent level.

Three or more years teaching full time at Community College or equivalent level.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Provide general management, leadership and assistance required for the effective and effecient delivery of academic and vocational programs, courses and support activities in the area of responsibility.

2. Coordinate with central services and assist or indirectly supervise or monitor operations such as library, bookstore, plant maintenance, IMC or student services.

3. Assist the campus Executive Dean in long range planning, budget development and control and other duties as assigned.

2-26-82

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

Level F

JOB TITLE: Dean of Student Services

RESPONSIBLE TO: President

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

Supervise and coordinate the activities of the Student Services Division.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Masters degree in Educational Administration, Student Personnel Services and Counseling. Doctorate preferred.

Experience:

Minimum of five years of experience working in areas of Student Services Personnel Services. Administrative experience preferred.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

1) Supervise (directly) the department activities of 12 Student Services coordinators.
2) Supervise (indirectly) approximately 185 administrators, faculty, classified full and part time staff.
3) Monitor and approve expenditures and accounts for Student Services division budget.
4) Process activities for Student Services departments.
5) Facilitate and provide support for activities of Student Services departments.
6) Analyze needs of Student Services departments.
7) Interpret college and Student Services department policies.
8) Resolve problems for part time staff and administrators.
9) Coordinate Student Services department activities with those of other divisions.
10) Provide divisional reports as needed.
11) Provide data for the president as required.
12) Conduct staff and division meetings as needed.
13) Participate in Oregon Community College Deans of Student Services organization.
14) Represent PCC in state and regional organizations.
15) Other duties as assigned by the President.

4-22-82

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

Generic
Level F

JOB TITLE: (Services) Director

RESPONSIBLE TO: Vice President

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The Services Director is directly responsible to a Vice President for collegewide administration of one or more major service or educational support areas, which could include libraries, instructional support, media centers, data processing, auxiliary, plant or personnel services. The director may supervise instructional and/or service or support areas such as, data processing or food services.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Master's degree or equivalent. Emphasis placed on areas in which special expertise is required such as business, educational or personnel administration, systems science, communication, curriculum development, architecture or engineering.

Experience:

Five or more years experience in mid-level management in community college, higher education, business or industry.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

Collegewide administration of a major service or educational support area would include some if not all of the following:

1. Provide general management, leadership and assistance required for the effective collegewide delivery of administrative, instructional, student support, or plant services in the area of responsibility.

2. Coordinate with instructional or service areas and assist or monitor collegewide instructional support services activities, use of computerized systems, or employment and personnel practices.

3. Assist the Vice President in long range planning, budget development and control and other duties as assigned.

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

Generic
Level G

JOB TITLE: Executive Campus Dean

RESPONSIBLE TO: President

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

An executive dean is chief administrator, and responsible for all instructional programs on a campus or group of centers and for community services for a portion of the Portland Community College District.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Ph.D. or equivalent is required, with emphasis on community college or higher education administration, finance and curriculum.

Experience:

Five or more years of educational administration, community college experience preferred. Five years teaching experience required. Experience in budgeting, personnel supervision, educational planning preferred.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Administer all campus instructional programs.
2. Work with central college services to provide for day-to-day operation, curriculum, support for the instructional programs, and student needs.
3. Administer community services for a geographical portion of the district.
4. Represent the college to the community.
5. Budget development and control.
6. Participate in policy development and long range planning for curricular and facility needs through participation in the President's Cabinet and in other duties as assigned by the President.

4-22-82

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION

JOB TITLE: (Services)Vice President — Generic Level G

RESPONSIBLE TO: President

AUTHORIZED BY: President

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The Services Vice President is directly responsible to the President for collegewide administration of major service areas. Specific areas to be assigned by the President.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Education:

Ph.D. or equivalent is required. Emphasis placed on areas where specific expertise is required such as educational administration, industrial engineering or finance.

Experience:

Five or more years of broad experience in college, administration or equivalent experience. Specific expertise in major responsibility areas which could include instruction, media services, student services, financial and materials management, personnel administration, or plant maintenance and operation. Teaching experience at a college or university.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

Collegewide administration of major service areas. Responsibilities of the Vice President would include some if not all of the following:

1. Work with executive campus deans to provide for day-to-day operation, curriculum, support for the instructional programs and student needs.
2. Supervise all business practices of the college to insure compliance with all laws and procedures prescribed by local, state and federal government.
3. Evaluate and review academic programs, assist with faculty selection, supervise media, research and planning.
4. Direct new facilities planning and development; all plant and properties maintenance and equipment.
5. Supervises procurement and control of all educational materials, supplies and capital equipment.
6. Oversee operation of food services, bookstores, libraries, instructional materials centers, student, personnel, computer, business and auxiliary services.
7. May act as chief executive officer of the college in the absence of the college president and other duties as assigned by the president.

Existing
1981-82

Portland Community College
Portland, Oregon

Administrative/Supervisory/Support Staff

Position Levels and Titles
(230 Working Days)

LEVEL G - $34,000-$45,000

Executive Dean and Vice President

LEVEL F - $29,000-$37,000

Associate Dean, Dean and Director

LEVEL E - $26,000-$34,000

Assistant Dean, Director II and Department Chair

LEVEL D - $24,000-$31,000

Coordinator, Manager, and Department Chair II

LEVEL C - $21,000-$28,000

Coordinator II and Manager II

LEVEL B - $18,000-$24,000

Supervisor, Specialist and Technician

LEVEL A - $15,000-$21,000

Supervisor II, Technician II,
Specialist II and Assistant.

5-7-82

Proposed
1982-83

Portland Community College
Portland, Oregon

Administrative/Supervisory/Support Staff
(230 Working Days)

Position Levels and Titles

LEVEL G - $38,000 - $48,000
Executive Dean and Vice President

LEVEL F - $31,000 - $40,000
Associate Dean, Dean and Director

LEVEL E - $28,000 - $37,000
Assistant Dean, Director II and Department Chair

LEVEL D - $26,000 - $34,000
Coordinator, Manager and Department Chair

LEVEL C - $23,000 - $31,000
Coordinator II and Manager II

LEVEL B - $19,000 - $26,000
Supervisor, Specialist and Technician

LEVEL A - $16,000 - $23,000
Supervisor II, Technician II,
Specialist II and Assistant

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ADMINISTRATIVE SALARY LEVEL CLASSIFICATION

Some significant differences between levels --

G over F	Participate with President in executive decisions including President's staff. Responsibility over entire campus including instruction college-wide services. Future Planning -- Heavy Impact -- Major College Decisions All Ph.D's and/or 85 points experience.
F over E	Responsibility for some major college-wide services or large multi-department instructional area. Substitute member -- President's Staff
E over D	May be on President's Staff Major responsibility for college-wide planning, decision making input, or large instructional area.
D over C	Programs or smaller size instructional area. Financial Responsibility -- Considerable secondary responsibility for F or G level responsibility.
C over B	Secondary Responsibility for duties of D or E level. College-wide level of services Decisions -- Mid-level complexity
B over A	Numbers of employees supervised plus responsibility for department size services to college or campus of a more routine or defined nature (such as Business Office/Payroll/ staff Employment/Data Processing/Custodial).
A	Usually assists B level or above -- Smaller number supervised -- Work of routine or defined nature, includes technical specialists.

2/1/82

ADMINISTRATIVE JOB LEVEL PLACEMENT

BASED ON FACTORING OF JOBS

Level G

620 and Above Points

Job Title

Executive Dean
- Cascade Campus
- College Centers
- Rock Creek Campus
- Sylvania Campus

Vice President
- Administrative Services
- Educational Services

Level F

485 to 619 Points

Job Title

Associate Dean
- Business & Industry, Sylvania
- Instruction, Cascade
- Instruction, Rock Creek
- Instruction, Southeast/Ross Island
- Science and Health, Sylvania
- Social Science/Communication/Sylv.

Dean, Student Services

Director
- Data Processing
- Developmental Education
- Instructional Support
- Personnel Services
- Plant Services

ADMINISTRATIVE JOB LEVEL PLACEMENT (CONT'D)

LEVEL E

450 to 484 Points

Job Title

Department Chair
- Apprenticeship Program
- Building & Ag. Careers
- Business Education
- Creative Arts & Education
- Dental Programs
- Engineering
- English and Foreign Languages
- Government Services
- Home Economics
- Management Services
- Mechanical Careers
- Nursing
- Physical Education
- Science & Industry
- Science & Mathematics
- Social Science
- S. E. Credit, RE, IFE, Comm. Ed., Treaty Oak
- Visual and Performing Arts

Director II
- Business Services
- Career Planning/Placement
- District Relations
- Financial Aids
- Human Resources
- Institute Community Assistance
- Libraries
- Research and Planning

ADMINISTRATIVE JOB LEVEL PLACEMENT (CONT'D)

Level D

375 to 449 Points

Job Title

Coordinator
- Accounting
- Campus (Student) Services, Cascade
- Community Services
  - Cascade
  - Rock Creek
  - Sylvania
- Drop-In Centers
- Educational Services
- ESL Refugee Project
- Handicapped Students & Emergency Medical Services
- H. S. Relations/College Activities
- IMC Production
- Sylvania Campus Services & Testing

Department Chair II
- Health Records
- Medical Lab Technician
- Radiology Technician

Manager
- Bookstore
- Business Office

Supervisor, Food Production & Service

ADMINISTRATIVE JOB LEVEL PLACEMENT (CONT'D)

Level C

300 to 374 Points

Job Title

Coordinator II
- Career Youth Program Workers Comp Contract
- College Records
- Cooperative Education
- Custodial Services, Sylvania
- Journalism Program
- Legal/Risk Services
- Media Processing
- Payroll/Accts. Payable
- Personnel Services
- Program Marketing
- Refugee Employment Projects
- Registration
- Research/Projects
- Separate Projects
- Special Services
- Staff Development
- Student Services, Rock Creek (Veterans Spec.)
- Veterans Affairs

ADMINISTRATIVE JOB LEVEL PLACEMENT (CONT'D)

Level B

240 to 299 Points

Job Title

Specialist
- Bi-cultural
- Data and Reports
- Financial Aid
- Veterans Affairs

Supervisor
- Apprentice/Trade Extension
- Audio Visual Services
- Campus Safety
- Career Placement
- College Farm
- Computer Operations
- Coop Day Care
- Custodians
  - Cascade
  - Centers
  - Rock Creek
- Grounds Maintenance
- Payroll
- Refugee Program
- Student Affairs
- Work Experience

ADMINISTRATIVE JOB LEVEL PLACEMENT (CONT'D)

Level A

0 to 239 Points

Job Title

Assistant to Executive Dean
Custodial Services Assistant

Specialist II
Cooperative Education
Cooperative Education
Cooperative Education
Electronics
ESL Project
High School Completion
Job Developer
Job Developer
Job Developer
Job Developer
Job Developer
Job Developer
Job Developer
Job Developer
Job Development/Career Outreach
Program Advisor
Program Advisor
Refugee Job Project
Special Services Program Advisor
Testing/ESL Educational Assessment

Supervisor II
Central Stores
Registration Processing
Swimming Pool/Intramurals
Terminals
Tutors
Tutors/Volunteers

1981-82 PCC Administrators Salary Comparisons to Other Community Colleges (with similar F T E and/or Budget)

	PCC	PCC LEVEL RANGE	NASSAU C.C. N.Y.	DALLAS C.C. DIST.	MT. SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE	CERRITOS COLLEGE	EL COMINO C.C. DIST.	CONTRA COSTA COLLEGE DIST.	LOS RIOS C.C. DIST.
Vice President: ADMIN/ED SERVICES	$38,600- 43,200	$34,000- 45,000	$50,919	$31,700- 47,550	$57,672- 60,864	-- --	$55,615- 57,615	$45,180- 55,188	$47,147- 53,495
Executive Deans	42,400	34,000- 45,000	-- --	29,100- 43,650	51,252- 54,456	-- --	49,546- 51,546	40,884- 49,944	47,147- 53,195
Associate Deans	31,500- 33,500	29,000- 37,000	-- --	-- --	46,452- 49,644	$43,000- 48,774	46,637- 48,637	38,880- 47,496	37,884 44,214
Dean, Student Services	35,300	29,000- 37,000	-- --	-- --	48,060 51,252	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --
Director, Data Processing	34,500	29,000- 37,000	-- --	29,100- 43,650	46,452- 49,644	40,500- 45,938	46,637- 48,637	36,984- 47,496	-- --
Director, Personnel Services	26,500	29,000- 37,000	34,720- --	31,700- 47,550	46,452- 49,644	-- --	28,036- 30,036	-- --	-- --
Director, Plant Services	33,900	29,000- 37,000	28,707- --	29,100- 43,650	35,244- 38,436	33,000- 37,431	34,844- 36,844	-- --	-- --
Business Services	30,500	26,000- 34,000	-- --	29,100- 43,650	51,252 54,456	33,000- 37,431	36,812- 38,812	38,880- 47,496	-- --
Financial Aid	33,200	26,000- 34,000	32,550	22,000- 33,000	33,636- 36,828	32,211- 34,211	-- --	26,064- 31,836	-- --
Libraries	33,000	26,000- 34,000	42,796 --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	35,184- 42,984	-- --
Research & Planning	28,800	26,000- 34,000	44,004 --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --
Human Resources	33,000	26,000- 34,000	40,112 --	22,000- 33,000	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --
District Relations	24,000	26,000- 34,000	-- --	24,500- 36,750	-- --	-- --	25,900- 27,900	-- --	-- --
Counseling	30,400	24,000- 31,000	44,542 --	24,500- 36,750	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --
Handicapped Services	26,500	24,000- 31,000	-- --	18,000- 27,000	41,640- 44,856	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --
Veterans Affairs	25,000	21,000- 28,000	-- --	-- --	33,636- 36,828	-- --	-- --	24,600- 36,144	-- --
Grounds Maintenance	17,500	18,000- 24,000	-- --	-- --	19,224- 22,416	-- --	34,844- 36,844	-- --	-- --
Custodial	18,600 22,700	18,000- 28,000	-- --	-- --	19,224- 22,416	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --
Sup. Campus Safety	19,500	18,000- 24,000	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --	24,600- 36,144	-- --
Central Stores	17,500	15,000- 21,000	--	--	22,416 25,632	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --

Continued . . .

650

1981-82 PCC Administrators Salary Comparisons to Other Community Colleges (with similar F T E and/or Budget) (continued

	HOUSTON C.C. SYSTEM	SAN FRANCISCO C.C. DIST.	NORTH ORANGE C.C.DIST.	SAN DIEGO C.C. DIST.	OCCA Average Salaries	Enrollments 10,000 Admin Compensation Survey	Budgets 10 Million Admin Compens. Survey	Portland State University
Vice President: ADMIN/ED SERVICES	$39,036- 50,424	$57,073 --	$42,730- 55,135	-- --		$46,930- 55,398	$41,516- 51,000	
Executive Deans	36,996- 48,396	54,953 --	40,954- 52,972	-- --				
Associate Deans	-- --	37,269 --	39,177 50,891	-- --				
Dean, Student Services	-- --	40,920- 51,612	-- --	-- --	$36,348			
Director, Data Processing	31,056- 42,492	-- --	38,290- 49,730	-- --	29,971	33,357- 41,250	28,971- 37,306	
Director, Personnel Services	29,256- 40,776	-- --	29,404- 38,918	-- --	29,288	32,000- 41,751	29,000- 39,650	$18,552- 33,372
Director, Plant Services	29,256- 40,776	-- --	34,733- 45,485	$24,180- 29,400	29,043	28,663- 39,504	28,152- 35,023	19,488- 28,776
Business Services	32,388- 43,776	40,920- 51,612	-- --	38,280- 46,356		31,406- 38,379	28,710- 35,295	
Financial Aid	-- --	-- --	23,184- 31,351	-- --	28,927	27,512- 35,704	25,000- 33,200	
Libraries	-- --	-- --	37,400- 48,649	-- --	30,503	32,828- 39,492	28,811- 37,992	
Research & Planning	29,256- 40,776	40,920- 51,612	35,625- 40,485	-- --	31,889	28,800- 40,393	25,500- 35,071	
Human Resources	-- --	-- --	-- --	40,140- 48,696		29,340- 36,088	22,611- 36,088	
District Relations	26,064- 31,836	-- --	23,184- 31,315	-- --	26,622	20,836- 33,782	20,670- 29,893	
Counseling	-- --	33,984- 42,864	33,845 44,324	-- --	31,667	28,954- 41,895	29,423- 38,516	
Handicapped Services	24,600- 36,144	33,984- 42,864	-- --	-- --				
Veterans Affairs	-- --	-- --	20,518- 28,108	-- --				
Grounds Maintenance	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --				16,800- 21,492
Custodial	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --				12,876- 20,472
Sup. Campus Safety	-- --	30,972 39,060	-- --	27,372- 33,072		19.991- 34,355	20,076- 27,949	14,592- 21,492
Central Stores	-- --	-- --	-- --	-- --				17,654- 19,488

OTHER POSITIONS AT PCC AND PSU

	PCC SALARY	PCC RANGE	PSU RANGE
Administrative Assistant	$19,000	$15,000-21,000	$12,300-21,492
Supervisor of Accounting	25,600	24,000-31,000	15,300-19,488
Data Entry Supervisor	16,000	15,000-21,000	11,820-14,592
Computer Services Supervisor	21,000	18,000-24,000	20,472-26,124
Food Services Manager/Supervisor	22,000	24,000-31,000	15,300-26,124

SUMMARY OF SALARY COMPARISON

PCC administrative salaries in general are fairly competitive with those at other Oregon Community Colleges as well as at PSU. However, when compared with those of other community colleges with similar characteristics (i.e., FTE and/or budget) across the nation, such PCC salaries are lower. This can be seen both from the eleven respondents to our survey as well as from the average given in the College & University Personnel Association.

Consideration should be given to the fact that PCC pays the total retirement contribution whereas in most other states in the nation it is participating.

5-7-82

OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGES
SALARIES OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS
ACADEMIC YEAR 1981-82

POSITION	BLUE MNTN	COCC	CHEME-KETA	CLACK-AMAS	CLATSOP	LANE	LINN BENTON	MT. HOOD	PORT-LAND	ROGUE	SWOCC	TVCC	UMPQUA	AVERAGE SALARY
Presidents	43,420	49,846	52,470	50,292	42,000	54,216	49,950	48,640	55,000	45,500	Negot.	35,450	45,864	
Deans Instruction	36,675	39,433	41,976	43,836	38,642	41,110	35,577	39,900		37,635	39,294	31,247	40,124	38,787
Deans Stu/Pers.	34,559	34,422	41,976	40,440	35,128	39,698	36,718	39,900	35,300	33,826	36,362	28,789	35,402	36,348
Deans Development	35,643	25,907						40,820						34,123
Chief Business Mgr.	33,555	36,427	41,976	43,836	35,128	39,345	36,718	40,900	43,200	31,085	35,053	29,476		37,225
DEANS/DIRECTORS														
Academic Affairs														
Business Assist.		27,797		32,568		33,625	30,785				21,893			29,334
Business Instr.			34,980	35,532			33,077							34,530
Evening College			32,648											32,648
Adult/Comm. Ed.	33,555	28,285	41,976	38,700	34,467	38,729	27,864	35,420		36,235	30,876	25,692	35,402	33,933
Soc. Science		31,285				33,470	33,066							32,607
Life Science							33,077							33,077
Phys. Sci. & Math			33,814											33,814
Voc-Tech	35,643	27,998	33,814		34,467		30,025				30,876	27,139		31,423
Auxillary Service									33,200					33,200
Asst. to President						33,695					34,022			33,859
Library Admin.	25,603		33,814		26,826	27,239		35,860	33,000	30,958			30,721	30,503
Registrar/Dir. Adm.	33,555	29,392	34,980	35,568	30,712	35,591	30,084	29,210		21,210	29,002	16,477	24,070	29,154
DIRECTOR OF:														
Counseling				35,568			33,077	37,030			26,120		26,538	31,667
Data Processing	27,595	25,211	34,980	28,956	22,050	32,375	30,000		34,500		38,715		25,331	29,971
Financial Aid		25,628	30,316	30,264	27,915	34,633	29,733	34,040	33,200			23,652	19,892	28,927
Learning Resources		26,357					33,077				31,241		27,344	29,505
Personnel		26,606	34,980	31,620		27,680	27,513	37,250	24,500				24,154	29,288
Placement				31,620	20,936									26,278
Plant Service		24,760	34,980	35,568	21,264	29,680	31,019	36,960	33,900	20,400	23,667		27,280	29,043
Public Information		20,185		27,708	25,796	32,738	20,530	36,110	24,000		25,906			26,622
Research				32,028				34,840	28,800					31,889
Student Activities	25,01[illegible]	18,843	34,980	31,164		32,117	33,005	37,030	32,600			22,879	18,084	28,572
Bookstore Manager			29,150		11,471	21,478	23,188		26,000				17,948	21,539
Secretary to Pres.	13,300	15,948	20,687	14,304	17,076	17,776	17,774	18,660	19,201	16,232	14,771	16,267	17,448	17,265

P59

REV. 12/81

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Job Evaluation
Performance Evaluation

Albers, H. H. Principles of Management, Wiley, New York, 1969.

American Management Association, Inc., Make Performance Appraisals Work for You, AMA periodicals, New York, 1967.

American Society of Association Executives, Performance Evaluation: A Manual of Procedures for the Association Executive's Self-evaluation, Washington, 1970, 110 pp.

Barrett, R. S., Performance Rating, Science Research Associates, Chicago, 1966.

Beach, Dale, Personnel, Macmillan, New York, 1970, pp. 187.

Bell, R. R., Evaluating Subordinates: How Subjective Are you?, S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal, 1979, 44(1), pp. 36-44.

Bennet, C. L., Defining the Manager's Job, The AMA Manual of Position Descriptions, Research Study No. 33, American Management Association, New York, 1958.

Berenson, Conrad and Ruhnke, Henry O., Job Descriptions: Guidelines for Personnel Management, Personnel Journal, January 1966, Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 14-19.

Boynton, R. E., How Employees Measure Their Pay, Compensation Review, 2 (3), 1970, pp. 12-20.

Brady, R. H., MBO Goes to Work in the Public Sector, Harvard Business Review, Mass., 1973, 51(2), pp. 65-74

Brunsback, G. B., Consolidating Job Descriptions, Performance Appraisals and Manpower Reports, Personnel Journal, August 1971, Vol. 50, pp. 604-610.

Cangemi, Joseph P., Personnel Evaluation Rating Scale, Personnel Journal, vol. 49, no. 8, August 1970, pp. 665-667.

Carroll, S.J., Jr., & Tosi, H.L., Jr. Management by Objectives: Applications and Research, Macmillan, New York, 1973.

Chalker, James R. and Wiley D. Sutton, Developing an Objective Performance Appraisal Scale, Public Personnel Association, Applied research in public personnel administration, Chicago, 1970, pp. 23-28.

Crawford, Harold E., Sam A. Campbell, and Stanley Sloan, Conceptual Framework for Employee Appraisal Decisions, Training and Development Journal, vol. 24, no. 1, January 1970, pp. 46-49.

Cribbin, J. J., Effective Managerial Leadership, American Management Association, New York, 1972.

Culbreth, George, Appraisals That Lead to Better Performance, Supervisory Management, vol. 16, no. 3, March 1971, pp. 8-10.

Dartnell Corporation, Wage and Salary Administration, A Guide to Current Policies and Practices, A Dartnell survey, Chicago, 1969, pp. 305.

Deegan, A. Management by Objectives, n.d. This is a workbook, containing descriptive material, reference reading, and worksheets to be used in the implementation of MBO in both profit-making and not-for-profit organizations.

Doiron, Reginald C., The Personnel Evaluation Process, Journal of Systems Management, vol. 21, no. 7, July 1970, pp. 37-41.

Drucker, P., Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, and Practices, Harper & Row, New York, 1973.

Drucker, P. F., The Practice of Management, Harper and Row, New York, 1954.

Drucker, P. F., Managing for Results, Harper and Row, New York, 1964.

Drucker, P. F., The Effective Executive, Harper and Row, New York, 1966.

Dunn, J. D., and Frank Rachel, Wage and Salary Administration: Total Compensation Systems, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971.

Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E.E., & Weick, K.E., Managerial Behavior, Performance, and Effectiveness, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970.

Enell, John W., and George H. Haas (eds.), Setting Standards for Executive Performance, AMA Research Study No. 42, American Management Association, New York, 1960.

Epstein, Carolyn, A Subjective, Nonstatistical, Unquantified Appraisal of the Appraisals of Personnel Appraisals, published between 1965 and 1969, Journal of Navy Civilian Manpower Management, vol. 4, no. 4, Winter 1970, pp. 29-30.

Evans, William A., Pay for Performance: Fact or Fable, Personnel Journal, vol. 49, no. 9, September 1970, pp. 726-731.

Ewing, D. W., Long-Range Planning for Management, Harper and Row, New York, 1972.

Finkle, R. B. and Jones, W. S., Assessing Corporate Talent, Wiley-Inter-science, New York, 1970.

Gehn, J. W., Job Descriptions - A New Handle on an Old Tool, Personnel Journal, December 1970, Vol. 49, pp. 983-985.

George, C. S., Jr., The History of Management Thought, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972.

Gluck, H. R., Appraising Managerial Performance, Management Records, July-August, 1962.

Glueck, William, Personnel: A Diagnostic Approach, Business Publications, Inc., Dallas, 1974, p. 238.

Hay Associates, Accent on Appraisal, Management Memo No. 293, 1976.

Haynes, Marion E., Improving Performance Through Employee Discussions, Personnel Journal, vol. 49, no. 2, February 1970, pp. 138-141.

Heier, W. D., Implemen . Appraisal-by-Results Program, Personnel, vol. 47, no. 6, November-December 1970, pp. 24-32.

Hemphill, J. K., Dimensions of Executive Positions, Research Monograph No. 98, Ohio Studies in Personnel, Ohio State University, 1960.

Heyel, C., Appraising Executive Performance, American Management Association, New York, 1958.

Holley, W. H., Feild, H. S., & Barnett, N. J. Analyzing Performance Appraisal Systems, Personnel Journal, 1976, 55, pp. 457-463.

Holzbach, R. L., Rater Bias in Performance Ratings: Superior, Self-, and Peer Ratings, Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, pp. 579-588.

Howell, Margaret A. and Sidney H. Newman, Narrative and Check-Off Evaluations of Employee Performance, Public Personnel Review, vol. 32, no. 3, July 1971, pp. 148-150.

Hughes, C. L., Goal Setting, American Management Association, New York, 1965.

Humble, John W., Improving Management Performance: A Dynamic Approach to Management by Objectives, Management Publications Ltd., London, 1969, 63 pp.

Humble, J. W. Management by Objectives in Action, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970.

Iowa, Employment Security Commission, Performance Evaluation Report; supervisor's handbook, prepared by Personnel Department, Des Moines, 1965, 14 pp.

Ivancevich, J. M., Szilagyi, A. D., Jr., & Wallace, M. J., Jr. Organizational Behavior and Performance, Goodyear, Santa Monica, Calif. 1977.

Keane, G. F. Strengthening College Administration, Management Controls, 1970, 17(3), pp. 56-61.

Kearney, W. J., Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales--MBO's Missing Ingredient, Personnel Journal, 1979, 58, pp. 20-25.

Keeley, M., A Contingency Framework for Performance Evaluation, Academy of Management Review, 1978, 3, pp. 428-438.

Kellogg, Marion J., What to Do About Performance Appraisal, American Management Association, New York, 1965.

Koontz, Harold, Appraising Managers as Mangers, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971, 239 pp.

Laughlin, Thomas C. and Daniel P. Kedzie, What Employees Want in an Appraisal, Best's review, vol. 72, no. 3, July 1971, pp. 69-70.

Lazer, R. I., & Wikstrom, W. S., Appraising Managerial Performance: Current Practices and Future Directions, (Conference Board Rep. No. 723), New York: Conference Board, 1977.

Lazer, R. I., & Wikstrom, W. S., New Pattern of Management, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1961.

Lazer, R. I., & Wilstrom, W. S., The Human Organization, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967.

Levinson, H., Management by Objectives: A Critique, Training and Development Journal, 1972, 26(4), pp. 3-8.

Likert, R., New Patterns of Management, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1961.

Loen, R. O., Manage More by Doing Less, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971.

Lopez, F. M., Jr., Evaluating Employee Performance, Public Personnel Association, Chicago, 1968.

Mager, R. F. and Pipe, P., Analyzing Human Performance, Hawthorn Books, New York, 1972.

Mager, Robert F. and Peter Pipe, Analyzing Performance Problems, or "you really oughta wanna," Fearon Publishing, Belmont, Calif., 1970, 111 pp.

Mahler, W. R., and Frazier, G., Performance Appraisal: A Common Sense Approach, in Merrill, H. & Martin, Elizabeth, Developing Executive Skills, American Management Association, New York, 1958.

Maier, N. R. F., The Appraisal Interview: Objectives, Methods, and Skills, Wiley, London, 1958.

Mall, P., Managing by Objectives, Wiley, New York, 1972.

Marcus, E. E., What Do You Mean, 'Evaluation'?, Personnel Journal, Vol. 50, No. 5, May 1971, pp. 354-358, 411.

Marvin, P., Management Goals: Guidelines and Accountability, Dow Jones-Irwin, Homewood, Ill., 1968.

Mintzberg, H., The Nature of Managerial Work, Harper & Row, New York, 1973.

Mironovitch, Serge G, Systematic Approach to Performance Appraisals, Supervisory Management, vol. 14, no. 12, December 1969, pp. 24-27.

Mobley, W.H., The Link Between MBO and Merit Compensation, Personnel Journal, 1974, 53, 423-427.

Morley, Virginia (Pseud.), Writing Job Descriptions That Mean Something, Supervisory Management, May 1962, Vol. 7, No. 5, pp. 6-10.

Morley, Virginia (Pseud.), Why Bother With Job Descriptions?, Supervisory Management, April 1962, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 22-23.

Morrisey, George L., Appraisal and Development Through Objectives and Results, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, Mass., 1972.

Morrisey, George L, Management by Objectives and Results, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1970, 164 pp.

Myers, M. S., Every Employee a Manager, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970.

McCall, M. W., & DeVries, D. L., Appraisal in Context: Clashing With Organizational Realities, In D. DeVries (Chm.), Performance Appraisal and Feedback: Flies in the Ointment, Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September 1976.

McCall, M. W., Jr., Design and Implementation of Appraisal Systems, In D. DeVries, M. McCall, & S. Shullman, Performance Appraisal Workshop: Briefing Book, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, N.C., 1978.

McConkey, Dale D., Evaluating Managers, Updating the Management Process, American Management Association, New York, 1971, pp. 74-87.

McConkey, Dale D., Writing Measurable Objectives for Staff Managers, S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal, vol. 37, no. 1, January 1972, pp. 10-16.

McConkie, M. L., A Clarification of the Goal Setting and Appraisal Processes in MBO, Academy of Management Review, 1979, 4, pp. 29-40.

McCormick, E. J., Jeanneret, P. R., & Mecham, R. C. The Development of the Position Analysis Questionnaires (PAQ)(Rep. No. 5), Purdue University, Occupational Research Center, Lafayette, Ind., June 1969.

McGregor, D., An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisal, Harvard Business Review, 1957, 35(3), pp. 89-94.

McGregor, D., An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisal, Harvard Business Review, Vol. 50, No. 5, September-October 1972, pp. 133-138.

Norwich, Joseph J., How Useful Are Job Descriptions?, Executive, November 1968, Vol. 10, pp. 40-44.

Oberg, W., Make Performance Appraisal Relevant, Harvard Business Review, Vol. 50, No. 1, January-February 1972, pp. 61-67.

Odiorne, G. S., Management by Objectives: A System of Managerial Leadership, Fearon Pitman, Belmont, Calif., 1965.

Odiorne, G. S., How to Succeed in MBO Goal Setting, Personnel Journal, 1978, 57, pp. 427-429, 451.

Odiorne, G. S., Management by Objectives, Pitman Publishing Co., New York, 1965.

Odiorne, G., Management by Objectives, Pitman, New York, 1965.

Odiorne, G., Management Decisions by Objectives, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969.

Patton, A., How to Appraise Executive Performance, Harvard Business Review, Vol. 38, No. 1, January-February 1960, pp. 63-70.

Patten, Thomas H. Jr., Manpower Planning and the Development of Human Resources, J. Wiley, New York, 1971, pp. 253-277.

Prather, Richard, Training: Key to Realistic Performance Appraisals, Training and Development Journal, vol. 24, no. 12, December 1970, pp. 4-7.

Prien, E. P., & Ronan, W. W., Job Analysis: A Review of Research Findings, Personnel Psychology, 1971, 24, pp. 371-396.

Rakich, J. S., Job Descriptions: Key Element in the Personnel Subsystem, Personnel Journal, January 1972, Vol. 51, pp. 42-5.

Reddin, W. J., Managerial Effectiveness, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970.

Reddin, W. J., Effective Management by Objectives: The 3-D Method of MBO, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971.

Slusher, E. A., A Systems Look at Performance Appraisal, Personnel Journal, Vol. 54, No. 2, February 1975, pp. 114-117.

Teel, K. S., Performance Appraisal: Current Trends, Persistent Progress, Personnel Journal, 1980, 59(4), pp. 296-301, 316.

Tosi, H. L., Rizzo, J. R., and Carroll, S. J., Setting Goals in Management by Objectives, California Management Review, 1970 12(4), pp. 70-78.

Truda, Robin and G. W. B. Moffatt, The Assessment of Job Performance, Personnel Practice Bulletin, vol. 25, no. 2, Australia, June 1969, pp. 110-118.

U.S., Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs, Job Analysis, BIPP152-35 (December 1973).

U.S., Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Handbook for Analyzing Jobs, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972).

U.S. Department of Labor, Training and Reference Manual for Job Analysis, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1965.

Valentine, R. F., Performance Objectives for Managers, American Management Association, New York, 1966.

Valentine, Raymond F. Performance Objectives for Managers, American Management Association, New York, 1966.

Vroman, H. W., Differentiating MBO-appraisal Systems: A Contingency View, Journal of Business Research, 1975, 3, pp. 53-60.

Wexley, K. N., Performance Appraisal and Feedback, In S. Kerr (Ed.), Organizational Behavior, Columbus, Ohio: Grid, 1979.

Whisler, T. L., Appraisal as a Management Tool, In T. L. Whisler & S. F. Harper (Eds.), Performance Appraisal: Research and Practice, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York, 1962.

Whisler, T. L. and Harper, S. F. (Eds.), Performance Appraisal, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1962.

Whisler, T. L., and Harper, Shirley F., Performance Appraisal, Research and Practice, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1965.

Whisler, Thomas L., and S. F. Harper, Performance Appraisal, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., New York, 1962.

Wickert, Frederic R., and Dalton E. McFarland (eds.), Measuring Executive Effectiveness, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1967.

Wikstrom, Walter S., Managing by - and with - Objectives, The Conference Board, New York, 1968.

Wikstrom, W. S. Managing by--and with--Objectives, Personnel Policy Study 212, Conference Board, New York, 1968.

Williams, A. P. O., Increasing the Value of Management Appraisal Schemes: An Organizational Learning Approach, The Journal of Management Studies, vol. 7, no. 1, February 1970, pp. 23-36.

Wood, W. E., Position Descriptions: A Key to Finding Good Executives, Personnel Journal, June 1972, Vol. 51, pp. 450-451.

Zeitlin, Lawrence R. and Myron L. Katz, Personnel Performance Review: How to Set Up and Run a Profitable System, Organizational Behavior Institute, OBI Better Management Monographs, no. 2, New York, 1969, 42 pp.

Zollitsch, H. G., and Langsner, A., Wage and Salary Administration, (2nd ed.), South-Western, Cincinnati, 1970.

Zollitsch, Herbert G., and Adolph Langsner, Wage and Salary Administration, 2nd ed. South-Western, Cincinnati, 1970.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

OCT 15 1982